PRESIDENT The House will now resume discussion on Demands for Grants. At the time the House rose last evening item No. 48, page 6, of the agenda was under consideration.

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—DEMAND I—LAND REVENUE—(*contd.*)

Motion No 48—(*contd.*)

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam II*): Sir, I was supporting the motion moved by Mr. K. R. Elenkath. Sir, the garden lands in Kalkulam, Tovala and Agastisvaram were converted to wet lands at a huge cost after the completion of the Pechippara irrigation works. Sir, the garden lands were yielding only half of what it yielded after it was converted to wet lands. The converted lands are directly fed by channels and like the *ayacut* wet lands fed by tanks. In the case of *ayacut* lands, since the tank beds were auctioned, they also are irrigated by the Kodayar Project directly. We could not cultivate the *ayacut* lands owing to the scarcity of water in the Kodayar Reservoir. And under the existing rules, the Land Revenue Commissioner says that remission could not be granted in respect of these lands as they are left uncultivated by the cultivator's own fault.

Sir, I believe that the agriculturists are not in a position to cultivate these lands for reasons I have already stated. Even when some of the fields, are cultivated, they could not get water at proper times to feed those lands and thus to get a good crop. Therefore, in the matter of fallow remissions and in the matter of a general remission of tax, I press the necessity of granting the remissions even in the districts which are commanded by the Kodayar Irrigation Project.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Sir, I support the motion as I am in entire sympathy with the mover. I have got another motion in my name, Motion No. 78, which is almost similar to the motion before the House, except that it makes a specific reference to the taluks of Tovala and Agastisvaram. The object of my motion is to "discuss the desirability of granting liberal fallow remissions and also to grant *Kariva* remissions in respect of the lands of Tovala, and Agastisvaram for 1111 for Kanni and Kumbham *Kists*."

Sir, the failure of crops is mainly due to many causes such as drought, pests, etc., which are beyond the control of the ryots. Besides these causes, for the failure in reference to Tovala and Agastisvaram, there is also another cause, *i. e.*, change of seasonal conditions. During a particular time, namely just after the paddy plants have flowered, there is the necessity for a breeze to blow which would help much to complete a successful fertilisation. During this time, the fields should also be well watered and continuouly irrigated. But for the last two years, this necessary contribution by the periodical season was absent or untimely. These are also the causes that made the total failure in Nanjinad of crops for the last two years. What the authorities mean by *Kariva* is a complete drying up of the paddy lands without anything left even for cattle to graze upon. They do not take into con-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

sideration any partial or nearly complete drying up of fields for purposes of *karivu* remissions. It is enough if they were to find a trace of green colour in the plants to classify the fields straight away as those capable of producing crops and never as those fit to be treated as *Karivu*. That is why I impress upon the attention of Government the desirability of giving liberal *karivu* remissions for those lands also which could not yield anything whatever even though cattle are not let on them to graze. These must also be classified as *Karivu* lands deserving remissions. It is within the knowledge of the departmental head that cultivation is not even raised in most of the lands for Kanni crop in 1111 and they are lying fallow. And I may say 60 per cent. of the lands in the Tovala and Agastisvaram taluks are lying fallow without any hope of raising cultivation either for the Kanni or Kumbham crop in 1111. It may be noted that there lands are left to lie idle not through the fault of the cultivators but owing to their sheer helplessness to cultivate. The rules do not provide for fallow remissions. These lands also, I submit, Sir, should be given liberal fallow remissions. And I say, Sir, that this remission should be extended for the Kanni and Kumbham crops of 1111 ; because the time to raise cultivation for the Kanni crop is already over and now it is practically impossible to think of a Kanni crop. As regards Kumbham crop there is no possibility of even raising any cultivation. For Kumbhom crop, seedlings have now to be prepared in nurseries for which water is necessary. Sir, the simultaneous failure of the rains and of the Kodayar water has affected the next two crops very considerably and I do not hesitate to say that lands to a very large extent may lie idle and may not bear any crop at all during Kanni and Kumbham next year. So, I submit, Sir, that the Government should take into serious consideration these factors and grant fallow remissions for these lands during the Kanni and Kumbham *Kists*.

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*) : Sir, I support the motion. Nanjinad comprises the taluks of Tovala and Agastisvaram. Under no circumstances water cess should have been levied in so far as the *ayacut* lands of these taluks are concerned. I say, Sir, that the impcsition of water cess in Nanjinad *Ayacut* lands, when there is already land tax to pay, is quite opposed to law and equity also. In British India, there is no such practice.

PRESIDENT : We are not discussing any way the rules under which a particular tax is to be levied. The question is whether remission should be generalised.

MR. P CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*) : Sir, I am speaking of the rules obtaining in other parts of India only by way of comparison. Coming to the question of levying water cess, I have to say a few words about the Kodayar project. The project was started first of all with the idea of providing water to Nanjinad only. Subsequently that idea was given up and another Project was started for supplying water to Nanjinad by means of the Perinjany Reservoir. A third project was again started to supply water to Edanad and not at all to Nanjinad. Then by a trick of the Engineering Department, it

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. Chidambaram Pillai.]

was meant to supply Nanjiand also. As a matter of fact, Kodayar water as such never goes to Nanjinad. In Nanjinad, only 8,000 acres of land came to be converted under the scheme. In Eraniel and Kalkulam, the area converted was 22,000 acres of land. And water cess is at an uniform rate for these two districts.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): What does the member mean by saying that the Kodayar water never goes to Nanjinad?

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): As matters stand at present, Nanjinad is supplied with Kodayar water in a manner, analagous to Nedumangad being supplied with Aruvikara water and being taxed for the Willingdon Water Works. I request the Land Revenue Commissioner to take these matters seriously into consideration. Sir, Nanjinad has contributed a huge amount of money to the general revenue from the proceeds of the auction of tank beds and in spite of that, Nanjinad stands taxed to an insufferable extent. I wish that the Land Revenue Commissioner would consider all these questions in a sympathetic manner. With these words, I support the motion.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Sir, I rise to support the motion. The remission rules have to be completely changed. Tax is levied upon the yield of properties and where the cultivator does not get any income from land for causes beyond his control, Government should remit tax on such lands. Under the present rules, remission is granted only to certain taluks in the State under certain conditions. With regard to the taluks south of Trivandrum and the taluk of Shencotta remission rules permit remission of taxes. With regard to the other parts of the State, there is no rule which will entitle a ryot to remission of tax where there is a failure of crops. Owing to this rule, people in the other parts of the State find very great difficulties to get remission where circumstances entitle them to get remissions. In cases where the cultivator has spent a lot of money for cultivating the land and has not realised anything owing to the vagaries of the Season he is entitled to get remission and the State is not expected to ask him to pledge his other properties and pay the Sirkar tax. At present, since the rules do exist, it is with very great difficulty that we are able to impress upon the attention of Government the necessity to grant remissions where, through the failure of crops, the agriculturists are not able to cultivate their lands. This creates a situation which is rather inconvenient both to the ryots as well as to Government. The Dewan has to be approached very often in deputations for the purpose of granting remissions, because there are no remission rules. And even if the Dewan or the Government desire to grant remissions, they are very often unwilling to deviate from the usual rules Even if they have a feeling, they think that, by granting exceptional measures of relief by way of remissions in a number of deserving cases exceptions may become a general rule. I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

do not think that there is any other place where there are no remission rules which will entitle the agriculturists to get remissions. So, I would suggest that remission rules should be so amended as to enable the people of the whole State to get remissions where there is failure of crops. Arrangement may be made for the inspection of crops before the harvest where there is really a case of remission. With these words, I support the motion.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): Sir, I support the motion. The object of the motion, as stated in the list by the mover, is to impress upon the Government the need for effecting certain changes in the rules regulating the grant of remission of tax. Sir, definite remission rules have been framed by Government and they are restricted in their operation to certain taluks in Nanjinad, to some taluks to the south of Trivandrum and to Shencotta.

Remissions come under two heads *viz.* seasonal and non-seasonal. I shall make some observations about seasonal remissions. Seasonal remissions, which is one of the two primary kinds of remissions contemplated by the Rules, are classified under three heads, namely, *karivu* remissions, *tarisu* remissions and *nanjamelpunja* remissions.

I shall first deal with the *karivu* remissions. One of the rules relating to *karivu* remission provides that if, at the time of inspection by the Inspecting officer, the crop is found to be green (*patcha*, as it is stated in the rules), the ryot concerned may not be eligible for remission even if, ultimately, the crop ends in a complete failure; and the inspecting officer is not bound to make a further inspection of the field to satisfy himself as to whether the crop, which was green when he first inspected, did after all end in a successful crop. I submit, Sir, that this is a very unsatistactory state of affairs and it is absolutely necessary to make it obligatory on the inspecting officer to make a further inspection of the field to satisfy himself as to whether what he recorded as green actually ended in a successful crop.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Is not such inspection made on the application of the ryot concerned?

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): Yes.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Then, is it not open to the party to apply at the proper time?

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): But, it is not open to the party to compel the officer, under the Rules, to make a further inspection later on if it turns out that the crop is a failure.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is there no rule making it obligatory on the part of the officer to inspect the field at a later stage if necessary?

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): That is what I am complaining. The Rules, as they stand at present, do not throw any obligation on the officer to make a further inspection, if necessary.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. Chattanatha Karayalar.]

The offfcer may, in his discretion, make a further inspection. The Rules must throw an obligation on him to make a further inspection. That is a change in the Rules which I would very strongly advocate with regard to *karivu* remission.

With regard to *tarisu* or fallow remission, Sir, it is available under the Rules only for certain specified areas in Nanjinad. Government themselves have admitted in the Rules that the scheduled tracts are under special handicaps and stand in need of both *karivu* and *tarisu* remissions. That being so, I cannot see why the grant of *tarisu* remission alone should not be extended to the whole of the scheduled tracts. As a matter of fact, I know, and the Land Revenue Commissioner himself must be aware of, large tracts of land in the Shencotta taluk lying fallow. Certainly, such lands deserve the benefit of fallow remission. I therefore suggest that the necessary changes may be made in the Rules so as to allow *tarisu* remission throughout the scheduled area. With these observations, I support the motion.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): Sir, I rise to support the motion. My object is to bring home to the Government the fact that the Remission Rules now in force are extremely antiquated and not suitable for the present time, *i. e.*, for present-day conditions. These Rules do not give the ryots the much-needed relief in times of dire necessity. These Rules were framed with special reference to the peculiar conditions in particular localities, irrespective of the question whether those localities had plenty of rainfall or not. The Rules do not also discriminate between rain-fed and channel-fed lands. They also do not have any bearing as to whether the irrigation works in question were constructed at Government cost or not. Sir, it is high time that these Remission Rules are brought up-to-date so that they may benefit the ryots in the different parts of the State.

Sir, if there is any part of the State where these Remission Rules have to be interpreted in the most liberal manner possible, it is that part of Travancore known as Edanad, the area covering the taluks of Neyyattinkara and Vilavankod and some portions of Kalkulam. My friend, Mr. Chidambaram Pillai, said that the Kodayar water was originally intended for irrigating Edanad, Neyyattinkara and Vilavankod, and not Nanjinad.

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): What I said was that the original idea was that the Kodayar water should irrigate only Nanjinad.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): I would refer my friend, Mr. Chidambaram Pillai, to the Kodayar papers where the late Dewan Nanu Pillai, in his memorandum submitted to Government, has stated that the people of Vilavankod have the natural right for the Kodayar water and that, if the water was to be diverted from

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

its natural course and taken away for the Nanjinad area, that would amount to robbing the people of Vilavankod of their natural resources.

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Is the member aware that, even more than hundred years ago, a dam had been constructed there?

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): Sir, I am aware of the Pandiyan Dam which was intended for taking Thamravarni water for Nanjinad and not for taking the Kodayar water for Nanjinad. It was intended to divert the waters of the Tamravarni, the Travancore Thamravarni and not the Tinnevelly Thamravarni.

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Was there not a dam across the Kodayar itself even a hundred years ago?

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): I am aware of that dam, Sir; but before it was completed, it collapsed. It never materialised. Even now we can see huge boulders there.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): May I know what this controversy has to do with the Remission Rules? (*Laughter*).

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): For the edification of my friend Mr. Thanu Pillai, I might say that scarcity of water is the essence of our present discussion.

Sir, in this part of South Travancore, I mean the portion lying between Nanjinad and the capital town, Trivandrum, the condition of the ryots is simply deplorable. They have to depend entirely upon rainfall. We all know, Sir, that, for paddy cultivation, water is required at various stages in the course of the agricultural operations. We want water at the time of sowing. If there is no rainfall at the time of transplanting, just at the psychological moment, the whole crop is sure to fail, or rather it would be impossible to raise the crop. According to the present rules, failure arises only after the crop has been raised. Sir, remission arises now only in cases where it had been possible to raise the crop and where the crop has failed owing to subsequent scarcity of water. But what about cases where, owing to scarcity of water, the crop could not be raised at all? The present Rules do not make any provision for such cases. That contingency does not seem to have been taken into consideration by the revenue authorities when they framed the Rules. During the last season, there was failure throughout, either on account of want of water at a later stage after the crops had been raised, or because there was no rainfall at the sowing season.

I hope, Sir, that, at least in future, Government will frame suitable Remission Rules so that the ryots may get the much-needed relief in times of great water scarcity.

In this connection, I would also urge upon the attention of the Government the necessity to find out, to initiate and launch some new scheme to irrigate Edanad.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I ask whether he is prepared to take the Kodayar Project?

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): As a free gift?

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Yes.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): I should simply thank my friend for making that kind offer.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): Sir, I also rise to support the motion. I agree with my friends from South Travancore that the Remission Rules must be made as wide and generous as possible so that they may be applicable to all cases of failure of crops. These Rules, whatever they are, must apply to all parts of Travancore. The applicability of the rules must not be confined to any locality. That the benefit of the remission only should be enjoyed by the ryot whose land is situated in Nanjinad and that it should be denied to the ryot whose land unfortunately happens to be situated in Kuttanad or Kunnatnad is, I think, an invidious distinction which the Government should not countenance. The result of failure of crops is the same to the ryot whether the land is situated in South or North Travancore. (*Hear, hear.*) The ryots of North Travancore should be in a position to claim remission as a matter of right as much as the ryots in South Travancore are, if there is failure of crops. In North Travancore, Sir, besides the failure on account of drought, we have also failure of crops very often, especially in Kuttanad, on account of floods; and therefore, whenever failure of crops as a matter of fact happens, North Travancore should be equally entitled to the benefit of the rules, whether revised or not I think, Sir, that the Government will take this matter into their very serious consideration, especially in view of the fact that, for the last two years, the monsoons have been failing and the effect of drought is being felt very keenly in North Travancore.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*) Is it not a fact that North Travancore gets a greater rainfall comparatively than South Travancore?

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*) Yes.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Is that not a reason for the floods also?

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): Yes and Kuttanad which is as important a centre o paddy cultivation as Nanjinad is liable as often to failure of crops on account of floods as Nanjinad is liable to failure of crops on account of drought.

MR. P. CHIDAMBARAM PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I know from the member whether he is aware that, in areas commanded by the Kodayar Project, there is no remission at all?

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): I know nothing about it. It is on account of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

absence of these rules or the inapplicability of these rules in North Travancore, that the failure of crops in the Quilon Division, resulting from the failure of the last year's monsoon, did not attract the notice of Government to the extent it deserved. I must say that the ryots of the Quilon District were very shabbily treated in this matter. This is due, I may say, to the absence of proper inspection by the Division Peishkar and the Revenue Commissioner of the lands affected by drought. Now, I understand from the Revenue Commissioner that the Division Peishkar of Quilon recommended a general reduction of 20 per cent. of the tax in his Division. But the Revenue Commissioner was not satisfied with it and he returned the communication saying that investigation must be made in regard to each case of failure separately and recommendations made by the Peishkar on that basis. That, I think, is due to the fact that the Revenue Commissioner did not satisfy himself by actual inspection in those places that there was general failure of crops in the Quilon Division. I stated, at the time of the adjournment motion, that my own experience as a result of my travelling in those districts is that, in almost all taluks, especially in my constituency, there was general failure of crops; and yet while some of the taluks of the State got the benefit of the remission, the other taluks did not, not because they did not deserve it, but because the Revenue Commissioner failed to inspect those places and satisfy himself as to the failure before the harvesting of the crop. This, I am sorry to say, is want of sympathy to the suffering ryots in those places. This is a matter to which I should like to draw the very serious attention of Government, and I would therefore submit that it is better that there are definite rules for remission on account of failure of crops than that it should be left to the whims and caprices of individual local officers or the Revenue Commissioner. With these words I support the motion.

MR. R SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): Sir, I rise to support the motion. My point is that the Remission Rules require to be definitely drawn up for the whole State. My object is to point out to the House the necessity for Remission Rules for the whole State. In Kunnatnad and the neighbouring taluks, the present injustice is the result of want of proper rules for the whole State. There is a kind of cultivation in those taluks called ഇറക cultivation. This cultivation takes place during the month of Mithunam, that is, during the period called തിരുവാതിരഞാറ്റുവേല when there are the heaviest rains. It is only in this period that the sowing is possible. It was not possible to have this cultivation either, during 1109 or during 1110; and although there was no cultivation there the persons who hold such lands had to pay the tax subject, of course, to the reduction of 12½ per cent. That was the case in both these years. But as a matter of fact the lands were lying fallow. If there were fallow remission Rules, such landholders would not have had to pay any tax at all. It is only to emphasise that Remission Rules are required to be drawn up for such cases also that I rose to speak on the motion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): Sir, it appears to me that this is a very difficult and a very important subject. On the one side there is the demand of the people for the remission of tax and on the other side there are the perpetual requirements of public revenue. But, Sir, the Travancore Government has all along admitted—

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): May I know from the member whether he is aware that the motion relates to the revision of the Remission Rules and not to the actual remissions?

PRESIDENT: The revision of the present Remission Rules of course will result in the loss of revenue.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): I presume that the House will be intelligent to perceive that, without the help of the President. Before I express my opinion I certainly do not expect a friend of mine to come forward with a question. I have been answering questions and I am prepared to answer any question which he may put later. To proceed. I fully understood that the discussion relates to remission rules and I cannot for my part discuss that matter without alluding to the fact of remission. If there is no possibility of remission, there is no possibility of the revision of Remission Rules.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): May I know from the member whether remissions can be granted even without remission rules as they are done now?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): Certainly if there is no organised Government. I regard the Government of Travancore as an organised Government. There is a rule of law established here and I do want rules. That is also what other friends want.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): May I know from the member whether Government is backward in regard to North Travancore and forward in regard to South Travancore?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): I certainly understood that my distinguished friend would understand English. I never made any difference between North Travancore and South Travancore.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): May I know from the member whether there are rules for remission for South Travancore?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): I have known these for some time and I would add my humble contribution to the discussion by asking for remission Rules in North Travancore (A member: *Hear, hear.*) There is absolutely no necessity for puting the cart before horse and before hearing what a member is saying to interupt him with a number of questions. Sir, I throw myself on your protection. That is misunderstood by some members to be a weakness. But it is not a weakness. It is only a right. It is a most honourable thing that a member can do.

PRESIDENT: Let Mr. Velu Pillai go on.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. N. E. Varghese stood up in his seat.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Mr. Velu Pillai will continue.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*) : In *Kaliyugam* motives are very often misunderstood. When I ask for remission being given to all people who want remission, I am sorry the members who cannot see the other side of things force me to take more time than I should by interrupting me.

PRESIDENT : You must now go on with your speech.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*) Sir, I am of the most emphatic opinion that relief should be given in all parts of Travancore—Kunnattur, Kunnatnad, Alengad, Devicolam and Shencotta.,

MR EDAVANATT S. PADMANABHA MENON (*Shertala II*) · What about Shertala ?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*) : When I mentioned certain taluks, the member could have easily understood that I meant all taluks but only gave the names of a few.

Sir, I want to say something about South Travancore, for the cultivation expenses there are very great. To cultivate an acre would require between Rs. 30 and Rs. 40. It is a part of the country where there are no alluvial deposits. There is no green manure and no mountainous parts from which green manure could be obtained. So. that from time immemorial Nanjnad and Edanad ryots have been suffering. What little remained with them has been taken away by the Travancore Government. The people owned the tank beds and Government sold away all those tank beds. I am now pressing this point merely to say that, in framing the Remission Rules, the cost of cultivation in the various localities must be considered. I am not for saying that remission shall not be allowed to certain taluks. I mention this deliberately because Dewan Nanu Pillai's name was mentioned. He was one who understood the country and Dewan Mr. Rama Rao and he did so much for Travancore Vol. V of the Land Revenue Manual will show how much they did for the welfare of the Travancore ryots. The rules framed by them have been forgotten and naturally people suffer. I am very glad that Remission Rules for Shencotta also will be included. There is difficulty in Shencotta as there is difficulty in Nanjanad.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon II*) : Is there want of green manure in Shencotta ?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*) : It is a drier place than other places. Sir, Travancore is not an empire and I expect the members to know the nature of the various taluks. The difficulty arises this way, that when there are certain peculiar circumstances in one taluk and when a member adverts to them,, it is presumed that those circumstances do not exist in the case of other taluks. So I press once more that, in framing these Remission Rules, the cost of cuitivation in the various places should be taken into consideration.

MR. A. ESWARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam II*) : What about the comparative land tax in North Travancore ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: We are not at all discussing the incidence of taxation. We are merely discussing the necessity for revision of the Remission Rules.

MR. T.K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*) May I submit once more that all that is wanted is that while granting remission to all taluks, the cost of production in those taluks must be considered and that the atmospheric conditions and physical conditions of particular places must also be taken into consideration and elaborate rules should be framed.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Am I to understand that there must be special provision in the Remission Rules with regard to the cost of production?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Urban*): Certainly in order to do things in a logical, sensible and patriotic way, facts are more important than questions of law There may be differences between failures and failures. Some people may never cultivate properly while others who are industrious will do everything that is necessary for cultivation. I do not want to be drawn into more discussion, Sir.

I therefore submit that proper rules for remission have to be framed, not by *ipsi dixits* of departmental subordinates and heads of departments but by open discussion in which the members of the Assembly and the representatives of the people outside will be able to contribute something which will be useful to the Travancore Government.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*) Sir, before the Honourable member for the Trivandrum Town spoke, there was, I thought no argument advanced either to favour South Travancore or to condemn North Travancore. The impression has gained ground now that there should be some sort of difference with regard to the remission that is to be granted to South Travancore and Central and North Travancore. The distinction seems to be based on a thorough misconception of the actual facts. Sir, the remission rules are, I believe, meant to apply to cases where no cultivation is possible, and there is no yield to be got. Should not a ryot who cultivates a piece of land and gets nothing out of it owing to failure of crops, should he not be entitled to get a remission under the rules? There is no necessity of calling on *Kaliyuga* or any other *Yuga*. The only question is, if the ryot is not able to gather his harvest, should not a benevolent Government go to his help and give remission of tax? Land assessment is based on the yield of the property. Government have given that benefit to South Travancore. Why not that benefit be extended to North Travancore? What we want is that some rules should be made so that there may not be any necessity for approaching Government with a request whenever there is a failure of crop. That is all that has been asked by this motion.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): Does the member think that cost of cultivation should also not be taken into account?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR K KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): Sir, the cost of cultivation is absolutely irrelevant for a consideration of this motion. When there is no yield at all, why should we consider the cost of cultivation? That passes my understanding. If it is said that the remission rules should contain a provision for the payment to the ryot of a portion of the cost incurred by him for cultivation, whenever failure of crops occurs, I can understand the relevancy of it. Otherwise it must be considered purely as an alien fact which is brought in to confuse the issues. So far as we are concerned, we have no objection to give the benefits of remission to South Travancore. No sane man will raise any objection to extend this benefit to the ryots who are unable to get anything out of their cultivation. The question of the cost of cultivation is not relevant to this motion at all. With these words, I support the motion.

MR. EDAVANATT S. PADMANABHA MENON (*Shertala I*): Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion before the House. I express my entire agreement with the sentiments of my friend Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai Coming, as I do, from the Shertala taluk, where the Government have done practically nothing to help the agriculturists to cultivate their land, either by irrigation works or by cutting canals, and since we depend entirely upon the freaks of the monsoon for cultivation, I think Shertala has equal claim with any other taluk for remission of taxes. My earnest request is that the remission rules should be so modified as to bring in the taluk of Shertala also. Sir, I was pained to hear the other day from the Land Revenue Commissioner that the Dewan Peishkar of Kottayam reported that there was no failure of crops in the Kottayam District and as such there was no necessity for remission of taxes. That is not true, Sir.

In future, the remission question should not be made to rest soley on the report of a District officer. The remission rules must be extended to North Travancore.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): Sir, I wish to say a few words on this motion, not so much because I have anything new to say, as because it is an important matter on which I think even some repetition is permissible. It appears to me that this is not a matter on which there should be any inter-regional dispute. The matter is one affecting the whole State. From the Remission Rules, I find some reason why Government have not provided for remission in the Northern taluks. They say that there the assessment has been so adjusted that there is no necessity to provide for remission. They say that the seasonal variations in the Northern taluks are not so great as in the Southern taluks and that therefore no provision need be made for the remission in Northern taluks. I do not know how far that explanation is well-founded and whether the present-day conditions are quite consistent with the conditions existing at the time that explanaiton was offered. But Government have not totally ignored the Northern taluks, and it is not an arbitary rule from their point of view that they have enacted. Anyhow to me it appears that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the case of wholesale failure of crops as has occurred this year,—and it is feared it may occur next year also,—I think remission must be granted in the Northern taluks also Whatever that be, I want to emphasise one point. With regard to *tarisu* remission, I do not know why there should not be *tarisu* remission whenever remission is allowed in the case of failure of crops. But if on account of want of rain the cultivator cannot think of raising his crops, there is no provision in the rules for granting a remission. That is an anomaly that must be rectified.

I also want to refer to the way in which the rules are worked. The rule says that the tenant should make an application to the Tahsildar; he should forward it to the Proverthicar, who should make an inspection of the land and make a report within a few days. The Tahsildar himself should inspect in land within a limited time. In actual practice, this seldom takes place. As in the last season, when there was a wholesale failure of crops, I do not think it is possible for the Tahsildar to inspect all the cultivated areas even with the assistance of a Deputy Tahsildar It is well-known that there are many instances in which the Revenue Officers seldom make the inspection but make their report. Once I met a Tahsildar who told me that it so happened during the last season that the inspection was not possible within the time allowed and therefore he was not able to make a report. These Revenue Officers should be told that these rules are meant to be worked.

I wish to point out another fact. The Revenue authorities think that it is their duty to collect as much revenue as possible whatever be the condition of the ryots. That is a mistaken impression. One Proverthicar even told me that the Tahsildars and the Peishkars might say that inspite of the rules, it is the duty of the Proverthicar to collect as much tax as possible. I therefore request that these rules might be given full effect to.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Sir, it seems necessary briefly to recount the rules under which remissions are now granted and then to explain why no provision has been made in the rule for the grant of tax remissions in North Travancore in the ordinary course.

The rules now allow three classes of seasonal remissions: (1) *Karivu* remissions that is to say remissions on account of failure of crops due to drought; (2) *Tarisu* or fallow remissions: these remissions apply to lands left fallow; and (3) *Nanjamel-Punja* remissions; that is, remissions in respect of wet lands which are cultivated with dry crops owing to failure of rain. Now seasonal remissions are allowed under the rules in the case of a few taluks, namely, Tovala, Agastisvaram, Kalkulam, Vilavankod, Neyyattinkara and Shencotta. So far as *tarisu* remissions are concerned, they are allowed only in the case of certain specified areas in certain *pakuthies* in the southern taluks.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

It is necessary to explain why these remissions are granted only in the southern taluks and not in other places. As adverted to by my friend, Mr. Thanu Pillai, Government, in their order on the subject of Remission Rules, make a reference to the reasons which actuated them to make this difference. The order says :

> "No remission of any of the above descriptions is granted in any part of the country except the areas specified in the schedules aforesaid. The assessment on wet lands has been generally fixed with due regard to the ordinary variations of season so that the demand may be paid in bad season as well as good. The areas specified in Schedules I, II and III are exceptions to this rule and comprise special tracts, in which, owing to the heaviness of the wet land assessment, scanty rainfall and other local conditions, seasonal remissions have been found necessary and have been allowed in the past.
>
> The grant of seasonal remission is a matter of concession and not of right."

This is the the justification for a difference between North and South Travancore. We are all aware of the difference in seasonal conditions between these tracts. I may mention here that, in one particular case in North Travancore, remission is now allowed as a matter of course, *viz.*, in the case of breach of bunds in *Kayal* lands. In other cases, it is clear from the Government order why they do not treat central and North Travancore in the same way.

The question of remission has now come to the front because of the unfortunate seasonal conditions of last year. That does not mean that we want general rules. It is not expected such conditions will prevail always. These occurrences can be met by special rules. In the past year, we have made remissions in Central Travancore and we have even given fallow remissions where lands have been lying fallow, although the rules do not allow for the grant of fallow remissions. I take it that the conditions this year and last year were exceptional. Therefore, regular rules are not necessary to provide for such exceptional cases. Government have been sympathetic in the matter of these remissions. Although regular rules have not been in force, in certain tracts, remissions have been allowed.

So far as fallow remissions are concerned, I believe there is some reason why that has not been allowed. The land is expected to be cultivated as a matter of course, because there is provision for water in the Kodayar Irrigation tank. It is only rarely that lands will be left fallow. Travancore is a country which ordinarily has an abundant rainfall. Therefore it is not necessary to make provision in rules for grant of remissions for exceptional occurrences like a complete failure of the monsoon. All that Government has to do is to grant remissions where remissions are necessary, when crops have failed on account of drought.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*) : Is it the member's view that it is better that these cases are not regulated by proper rules and to leave them to the officers' discretion ?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : There is no necessity for rules for meeting exceptional cases.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*) : Is it not better to have rules for these cases?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : By the provision of such a rule, people will regard it as a matter of right.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*) : Is it not the case in South Travancore?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : Yes, but the conditions there are different.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S KRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon II*) : In regard to the impression left in the minds of the people there, do they take it as a matter of right?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : There people apply for remission as a matter of right.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon II*) : Cannot Government grant it as a matter of course?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : That is not very safe.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*) : May I know whether there is any harm in allowing it as a matter of right?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : Yes.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*) : May I know what that harm is?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): That cannot be allowed because it is really a concession. Sir, I was saying that the demand for rules has arisen only recently in the case of Central and North Travancore. That is only an exceptional necessity which has arisen on account of the failure of the monsoons which is a very unusual incident. Therefore I consider no general rules are necessary for grant of remissions in places where crops could be ordinarily raised without any difficulty.

MR. A. S DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*) : Is it the opinion of the member that the rules cannot be properly worked out by the Department?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : There are not such frequent occurrences as to justify the grant of remissions. Therefore I say that rules are not necessary.

In regard to inspection of fields, my submission is this.

PRESIDENT : The House will now adjourn. Before we disperse, I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that, out of the four hours that have been allowed for the discussion of this Demand, 3 hours and 35 minutes have been utilised and there still remain only 25 minutes more for the Demand after the House meets from 2 o'clock

The House adjourned at 1·5 P. M. and met again at 2 P. M. with the Deputy President in the Chair.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Before we rose for lunch I was about to refer to the statement made by Mr. Karayalar regarding the absence of two-fold inspection in the case of lands where the crops are green. I think he is mistaken about it. The rules provide for a second inspection, but it is discretionary with the officer to inspect. The relevant rule on the subject is this :—

> "In regard to applications for Kariyu remission, if the crop is found 'green' (പച്ച) at the time of inspection, a further inspection shall be made at a subsequent date at the discretion of the inspecting officer to ascertain the final stage of the crop and the result of such further inspection shall be separately noted in the *adavu* under the original entry by the inspecting officer."

From the rules we may gather that in the case of crops which are regarded as (*pacha*) green and which really are included in the *adavu* prepared by the Proverthicar, there is provision for a second inspection being made with a view to safeguard the interest of Government and not with a view to see whether the fields shown as *pacha* may be included in the *adavu*.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): Are the lands which are regarded as *pacha* entitled to remission ?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): If they are regarded as green and not subsequently excluded from the *adavu*, such lands will be considered as eligible for revision.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Who makes the enquiries and recommends the grant of remission ?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): There are rules laid down for that purpose. Applications are made by the parties. As soon as they are received, they are forwarded to the *pakuthi* officials for a detailed inspection and report within five days with an *adavu* giving a list of the land affected. These lists are checked by the Tahsildars if necessary assisted by the Deputy Tahsildar or Samprathi. The applicants will also be present at the time of checking.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know from the member whether the Land Revenue Commissioner has had any opportunity to come across such instances ?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) No. When extensive areas are affected, it is not possible for a superior official like the Dewan Peishkar the Land Revenue Commissioner to go to the spot and inspect the lands personally. First we get the application. These applications are forwarded to the *pakuthi* officials. The lists forwarded by the *pakuthi* subordinates are checked in detail by the Tahsildar or by the Deputy Tahsildar or Revenue Supervisor. After the lists are completed, a report is sent to the Division Peishkar who is also required to make inspections in case the area affected exceeds 100 acres in a *pakuthi*.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): Is the inspection made before or after the crop is taken ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): It must be made before the crop is taken.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur cum Pattanapuram*): Is it possible for the department to carry on so much correspondence before the harvest is over?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): It is not impossible ordinarily. Because, the thing has to be pushed through by the *pakuthi* officials who attend to it expeditiously. When, however, there is universal failure of crops, there will be difficulties in the way of pushing through the detailed enquiry quickly. But such universal failure of crops is exceptional and can be met by a general remission of tax.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know from the member whether there are instances where he has recommended for individual *kariyu* remissions in my taluk?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): I do not recollect.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*): Is the Tahsildar competent to make recommendations?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): The Rules say that he does not make a recommendation but he prepares a list of fields where the crops have failed by *kariyu*.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): Is there any necessity for making a recommendation when the bare facts are stated?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): There is no necessity.

MR. EDAVANATT S. PADMANABHA MENON (*Shertala I*): Under the existing rules, is it not necessary that we have to depend entirely on the report of the local officers in the case of North Travancore?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Yes. The fact of failure or otherwise of crops has to be examined by the local officials. No other course is possible. In the case of North Travancore, there are no rules for grant of remissions. But last year we gave special remissions in certain *pakuthies*. Reference was made to the fact that in Quilon that was not properly done. That was due to special causes which I need not enumerate here.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Is it not possible for a Tahsildar to go to the spot and recommend whether that land requires remission or not?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) The merits of the application have to be examined.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Is it necessary to conform to the rules?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) Yes.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Do the Tahsildars actually inspect the lands on receipt of applications?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): They do.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether the Commissioner issues any instructions to the subordinates, say, as to when a paddy land could be called *karivu*?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): No.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I have an idea as to when a land can be called *karivu* because difficulty has arisen with reference to the stages of particular growth of crops of paddy lands?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): As a matter of fact, the action of the revenue authorities begins from application by the party. If a party makes an application to the effect that his lands should be considered as *karivu*, that application is scrutinised. I am not aware of the particular difficulties that have arisen in South Travancore.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): It is not a fact that, even when parties say that their lands are *karivu*, the Proverthicar reports otherwise?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): I have not received any petition to that effect. Since the member says so, I presume that it has sometimes happened.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know whether fallow remissions were granted either this year or last year?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): No *fallow* remissions were granted but *karivu* remissions were granted this year. Even though parties had not applied for the same, such *karivu* remissions were given. There was a special order to say that applications might be dispensed with. That was allowed by the Government as a matter of grace.

Coming to fallow remissions, it is obvious that it will not be safe to provide for them by regular rule. For instance, I shall refer to the special condition in North Travancore. In practice, in some areas, lands are left fallow during some years and cultivation is made either in alternate years or once in three years with a view to ensure productivity of the lands. Such lands cannot get any remission.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know what is the member's opinion with regard to the several acres of paddy lands that got silted up on account of recent floods in Chirayinkil?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*): Such individual cases might be brought to the special notice of Government and they can be examined. We cannot pass general rules to meet such special cases. In certain cases, lands are left fallow owing to default

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. George.]

on the part of the cultivators. That might happen on account of a dispute between the neighbouring land owners or on account of the cultivator being unable to raise money to carry out agricultural operations. Hence ,in my view, it will not to safe to provide general rules for fallow remission.

On the whole, my view is that, so far as the present rules are concerned, they do not seem to require much amendment. In the case of Central and North Travancore, remissions can be made as and when they are necessary. There is no need to make rules to meet such exceptional cases. So far as Shencotta and South Travancore are concerned, there are rules in existence to meet all ordinary requirements ; and as I said, it is not safe to make general provisions for fallow remissions.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tocalu*) : May I know whether the member has any objection to revise the schedule for fallow remissions with reference to south Travancore ?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : That has to be examined. The schedules may be revised, if they need revision.

MR. N. E. VARUGHESE (*Tiruvalla I*) : I move that the question be now put.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*) : I have not very many words to add. This is an all-Travancore and important question. It is aimed for the benefit of the ryots as a whole, and not of a particular area. Some members said that the cost of cultivation is on the increase in some areas and that at the same time the production there is little. If that question has anything to do with the subject of amending the remission rules, it is only in this way. Those parts of the country where cultivators have to incur greater expenses—they may be more benefited, because they will not have to spend money even after knowing that they are going to waste the amount by the failure of crop that they could force from the conditions existing.

In that case such parts of the country, whether in South Travancore or in North Travancore, are going to be benefited if the rules are revised. The Government's difficulty is all the greater when we consider the fact that after the Kodayar Project which has been started with a specific purpose in view has recently failed and this would effect the revenue from South Travancore which has risen to a very large extent. This failure of Kodayar has, to a great extent, aggravated the situation. If we stick to the old rules without revising them, it will be a great hardship to the ryots for whose relief the remission rules are intended. The Revenue Commissioner has told us that even in south Travancore or in those parts of the State for which the remission is intended, it is not obligatory on the part of the Government to adhere to them. He said they cannot demand it as a matter of right but only as a concession from Government. As matters stand at present, we can

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

only to look to the good-will of the authorities for getting any relief. But if there are rules, the ryots feel a security and the revenue authorities or the subordinates take it as their duty to act up to the rules in force. Then there was one other serious difficulty which was raised by the Commissioner, that in North Travancore there are lands which the cultivators purposely allow to lie fallow, with the object of getting more crops, for three or four years. This is a question that has to be considered not when we deal with the question of remission of tax owing reasons beyond the control of the ryots, but at the time of the ensuing settlement. That also has no direct bearing on the motion. With these words, I strongly press the motion.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner*) : I have already stated the reasons why it is not necessary to revise the rules. But I would assure the House that the whole question will be carefully considered by the Government.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*) : I would like to know the sense of the House.

The motion was put to the vote of the House and carried.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : Motion numbers 49 to 87 lapse.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha I*) : Motion No. 71 relates to *Jenmikaram*.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : It is not on the same item of expenditure?

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*) : Jenmikaram is an entirely different affair. There is an item included in the Budget under *Jenmikaram* which of course is under the supervision of the Land Revenue Commissioner.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : Anyway there is no necessity to consider that point because the time allotted for this Demand is over. So this question may be decided later on. All the other motions lapse.

Motions Nos. 49 to 148.

The following motions lapsed for want of time :

MR. K. R. ELENKATH :

49. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN :

50. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :

51. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kottarakara*) :

52. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kottarakara*) :

53. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam II*):

51. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam II*):

55. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI:

56. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI:

57. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI:

58. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI:

59. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN:

60. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN:

61. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI:

62. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,691 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. N. JOHN JOSEPH:

63. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. M. N. NAIR:

64. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI:

65. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. G. NILAKANTAN:

66. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. C. ABRAHAM:

67. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI:

68. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI:

69. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. R. SIVARAMAN NAIR:

70. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI :

71. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Rs. 10.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI :

72. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Rs. 5.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI :

73. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR

74. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. M. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI :

75. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR ;

73 To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR :

77. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI :

78. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI :

79. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re 1.

MR. M. SIVATANU, PILLAI :

80. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :

81. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :

82. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :

83. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAN :

84. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 31,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :

85. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 31,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR:

86. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 31,631 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Rs. 5.

MR. S. J. NAIR :

87. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,231 for Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner by Re. 1.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. CHANGANACHERRY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI :

88. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 60,676 for Head Clerks, clerks, etc., by Re. 1.

MR. N. E. VARUGHESE :

89. To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,130 for local allowances to Devicolam and Peermade Establishments.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN :

90. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for travelling allowance by Re. 1.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI:

91. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for travelling allowance by Re. 1.

MR. M. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI :

92. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for travelling allowances by Re. 1.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :

93. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Trvelling Allowances by Re. 1.

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kottarakara*) :

94. To reduce the allotment of Rs.15,000 for Travelling Allowances by Re 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :

95. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Travelling Allowances by Rs. 5.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI :

96. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Travelling Allowances by Re. 1.

MR. K. P. KRISHNA MENON :

97. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Travelling allowances by Re. 1.

MR. K. MAHOMED :

98. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Travelling Allowances by Re. 1.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :

99. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15.000 for Travelling Allowances by Re 1.

MR. PUTUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :

100. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for Travelling Allowance by Re. 1.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :

101. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,686 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI :

102. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,686 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :

103. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,686 for Division Cutcherries by Rs. 5.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI :

104. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,686 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. M. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI :

105. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,686 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI :

106. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,23,581 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

THANU PILLAI :

107. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,23,581 for Division Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. N. E. VARUGHESE :

108. To omit the allotment of Rs. 420 for local allowances to Tahsildars, Devicolam and Peermade.

MR. N. E. VARUGHESE :

109. To omit the allotment of Rs. 180 for local allowance to the 1st Tahsildar, Trivandrum.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :
110. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 65,100 for Tahsildars by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN :
111. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsildars by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
112. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsildars by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
113. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsidars by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
114. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsildars by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
115. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsildars by Rs. 5.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :
116. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 66,900 for Tahsildars by Re. 1.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI :
117. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,500 for travelling allowance by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN :
118. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for remuneration to copyists by Re. 1.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :
119. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for remuneration to copyists by Re. 1.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN :
120. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,14,863 for Taluk Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. R. SIVARAMAN NAIR :
121. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,14,863 for Taluk Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR :
122. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,14,863 for Taluk Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
123. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,16,208 for Taluk Cutcherries by Rs. 5.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
124. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,16,208 for Taluk Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :
125. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 87,360 for Accountants by Re. 1.

MR. E. K. KUNJURAMAN :
126. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,04,570 for Proverthy Cutcherries by Rs. 5.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAN :
127. To reduce the allotment of Rs 3,04,570 for Proverthy Cutcherries by Re. 1.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR :
128. To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,084 for Revenue Supervisors.

MR. K. A. NARAYANA PILLAI :
129. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,122 for Superintendent by Re. 1.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :
130. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,856 for establishment by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
131. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,978 for Jenmikaram Settlement by Re 1.

MR S. J. NAIR :
132 To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand 1 by Rs. 2.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. S. J. NAIR :
133. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
134. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
135 To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
136. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Rs. 5.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
137. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
138. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
139. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
140. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Rs. 2.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
141. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN :
142. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN :
143. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. S. J. NAIR :
144. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Rs. 2.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH :
145. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH :
146. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH :
147. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
148. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 9,19,309 under Demand I by Re. 1.

The motion for a grant of Rs. 9,19,309 *minus* Rs. 2 under Demand I—Land Revenue—was put to the vote of the House and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND II.—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MR. G. B. E. **TRUSCOTT** (*Chief Engineer*) : Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 47,80,133 under Demand II—Public Works Department.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT. Motions numbers 149 to 152 are inadmissible. Next motion (No. 153) by Mr. John Joseph is admissible.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly